

REMARKS

Claims 2 through 81 were pending in the above-identified application when last examined. All claims were rejected.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112

In sections 3 and 4 of the Office Action, claims 4, 6, and 36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that the Applicants regard as their invention. In response, Applicants are canceling these claims and therefore request withdrawal of this rejection.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

In sections 5 and 6 of the Office Action, claims 2, 5, 7, 9, 10 – 13, 15 – 21, 24 – 27, 34, 35, 37 – 39, 43, 46, 50 – 55, 58 – 63, and 65 – 67 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,112,215 to Kaply (hereinafter “*Kaply*”). Applicants traverse this rejection.

Claim 2, as amended, is patentable over *Kaply* at least by reciting:

- receiving a request for user data, the request being presented as an electronic form;
- obtaining program code for filling in the electronic form;
- retrieving user data corresponding to a user;
- updating the user data with user data from a second location; and
- using the program code to enter at least a portion of the user data into the electronic form.

Support for this amendment is found in the specification on the last paragraph of page 10. In contrast, *Kaply* does not disclose the updating the user data with user data from a second location. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 2, as amended, is patentable over *Kaply* and therefore request withdrawal of this rejection with respect to this claim and all dependent claims. Further, as claim 34 recited substantially similar language, claim 34 and its corresponding dependent claims should be allowable for at least the same reason. In addition, as claims 66 and 67 recite substantially similar language, they should also be patentable over *Kaply* for at least the same reason.

Claim 11 is patentable over *Kaply* by at least reciting that “the user data is stored in a remote database.” In contrast, *Kaply* only discloses that the database storing the user data is

located locally, e.g., at a local terminal. For example, at column 5, lines 29 – 33 of *Kaply* discloses a local database 71 associated with a local terminal 51. While *Kaply* does disclose accessing remote databases, e.g., databases 72 – 79, these remote databases do not include user data. (Column 4, lines 49 – 62). Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 11 is patentable over *Kaply* at request withdrawal of this rejection.

Claim 12 is patentable over *Kaply* by at least reciting that “the user data is stored on a portable storage medium.” Contrary to the Examiner’s assertion, *Kaply* does not disclose storing the user data on a portable storage medium, but instead discloses storing the application 40 in various media. For example, *Kaply* states that “[o]ne skilled in the art should appreciate that the processes controlling the present invention are capable of being distributed in the form of computer readable media of a variety of forms” (emphasis added). The user data is not a process that controls the present invention but instead data used by the processes controlling the present invention. The user data itself is stored solely in a local database 71. Accordingly, claim 12 is patentable over *Kaply* and therefore Applicants request withdrawal of this rejection.

Claim 20 is patentable over *Kaply* by at least reciting that “using the program code includes presenting available multiple entries for each data field on a pull-down list.” In contrast, *Kaply* only discloses presenting a single entry for each data field. While *Kaply* discloses multiple data fields, *Kaply* does not disclose multiple entries for a single data field. For example, at column 5, lines 34 – 40, *Kaply* discloses transferring selected data entries to multiple data fields, but makes no mention of presenting multiple data entries for a single data field or selecting a single data entry from a plurality of data entries for a single data field. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 20 is allowable and therefore request withdrawal of this rejection. Further, as claims 21 – 24 depend from claim 20, they should be allowable for at least the same reason. In addition, as claim 54 recites a limitation substantially similar to claim 20, claim 54 and its corresponding dependent claims should be allowable for at least the same reasons.

Claim 24 is patentable over *Kaply* by at least reciting that “the multiple entries for each data field have been acquired in the course of filling in previous electronic forms.” Nowhere does *Kaply* disclose learning entries based on the filling in of previous electronic forms. For example, *Kaply* only discloses that the “database may be continuously updated by the user and customized to his own needs” (Column 6, lines 3 – 4). No mention is made in *Kaply* regarding learning new entries based on filling in previous forms. Accordingly, Applicants submit that

claim 24 is patentable over *Kaply* for at least this reason and therefore request withdrawal of this rejection. In addition, as claim 58 is substantially similar to claim 24, it should be patentable over *Kaply* for at least the same reason.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

In section 8 of the Office Action, claims 3, 8, 22, 23, 29, 44, 45, 47 – 9, 56, 57, 68, 73 and 74 – 81 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kaply* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,192,380 to Light et al. (hereinafter “*Light*”). Applicants traverse this rejection.

As claims 3, 8, 22, 23, 29, 44, 45, 47 – 49, 56, and 57 depend from claims that are all believed to be allowable, these claims should be allowable for at least the same reasons and therefore Applicants request withdrawal of this rejection.

Further, as claim 49 recites language substantially similar to claim 12, claim 49 is patentable over *Kaply* for the reasons stated above. Accordingly, the combination of *Kaply* and *Light* would not yield the invention as claimed in claim 49 and therefore, withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

Claim 68, as amended, is allowable over *Kaply* and *Light* by at least reciting:

receiving a request from a client for a program code unit, the program code unit being configured to enter user data into an electronic form;
updating the user data with user data from a second location; and
 initiating transmission of the program code unit to the client.

Support for this amendment is found in the specification in the last paragraph of page 10. Neither *Kaply* nor *Light* teach or suggest the updating. Accordingly, the combination of *Kaply* and *Light* could not possibly yield the invention recited in claim 68. Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 68 and its dependent claims are allowable for at least this reason and request withdrawal of this rejection. Further, as claims 75, 80, and 81 recite substantially similar language, they are their dependent claims should also be allowable for at least the same reasons.

In section 9 of the Office Action, claims 28 and 64 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kaply* in view of *Light* and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,249,284 to Bogdan (hereinafter “*Bogdan*”). Applicants traverse this rejection.

As claims 28 and 64 depend from claims that are all believed to be allowable, these claims should be allowable for at least the same reasons and therefore Applicants request withdrawal of this rejection.

In section 10 of the Office Action, claims 30 – 33, 40 – 42, and 69 – 72 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kaply* in view of *Light* and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,199,079 to Gupta et al. (hereinafter "*Gupta*"). Applicants traverse this rejection.


As claims 30 – 33, 40 – 42, and 69 – 72 depend from claims that are all believed to be allowable, these claims should be allowable for at least the same reasons and therefore Applicants request withdrawal of this rejection.

Accordingly, for at least the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2, 3, 5, 7 – 35, and 37 – 81 are allowable over the cited references. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2, 3, 5, 7 – 35, and 37 – 81 and early allowance of claims 2, 3, 5, 7 – 35, and 37 – 81 are solicited.

If the Examiner has any questions or needs any additional information, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney at 1 (650) 843-3375. If for any reason an insufficient fee has been paid, please charge the insufficiency to Deposit Account No. 05-0150.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 8/11/03
Squire, Sanders & Dempsey L.L.P.
600 Hansen Way
Palo Alto, CA 94304-1043
Telephone (650) 856-6500
Facsimile (650) 843-8777


Aaron Wininger
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 45,229

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this paper (along with any paper referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop Non-Fee Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450,

on

Date: 8/11/03 By: 
Aaron Wininger